



## **Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grant Fiscal Year 2000**

Grant Application  
Grant Application Instructions  
Grant Research Evaluation Overview & Summary  
Sample Board of Supervisors Resolution  
Mentally Ill Offender Defined for the Purpose of the Grant  
Senate Bill 1485 - Chaptered, September 15, 1998  
Proposal Evaluation Criteria

### **Important Notice to Applicants**

Counties may submit multiple program applications for Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grants. **Each program must be presented in a separate application and must identify a separate client population, cost summary, detailed budget, abstract, narrative program overview and evaluation.** To qualify as a separate program, the program must stand alone in its target population and research component and cannot be contingent on any other proposed program(s). Some information may be duplicated, such as the county information, identification of the Strategy Committee and Board of Supervisors resolution; however, each application must contain the required information in order that each program may be evaluated and ranked separately by the MIOCRG Executive Steering Committee.

MIOCRG Demonstration program(s) submitted by counties must fall within a target cap of \$5 million dollars for each separate grant application. Counties may exceed the target cap, however, they must provide a compelling case describing why the program cost will exceed the cap. The Executive Steering Committee will evaluate the funding component of the grant application based upon the information provided that is deemed to be reasonable and appropriate, given the program scope, anticipated benefits, comprehensiveness of research design, intensiveness of the interventions, population served and the amount of match funds over the minimum 25%.

Please follow the Instructions for Completing the Application (Attachment A).

**BOARD OF CORRECTIONS**  
**600 BERCUT DRIVE**  
**SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814-0185**

**TELEPHONE (916) 445-5073**  
**FACSIMILE (916) 327-3317 OR 322-5036**

## **DEMONSTRATION GRANT - FY 2000**

### **MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER\* CRIME REDUCTION GRANT (MIOCRG)**

**For Instructions on completing the Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Demonstration Grant Application - See Attachment A**

- Mentally ill offender is defined in Attachment "D"

***SECTION 1 - COUNTY INFORMATION***

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ INDIVIDUAL COUNTY

☐ REGIONAL PROPOSAL (MULTIPLE COUNTIES)

County(ies): \_\_\_\_\_

Program Name and Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Sheriff or Director, Department of Corrections: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

County Financial Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION 2 - COST SUMMARY**

STATE FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 MATCH (25% REQUIRED):

Hard Match \$ \_\_\_\_\_

In-Kind Match \$ \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION 3 - DETAILED BUDGET**

	STATE FUNDS	MATCH	TOTAL
COUNTY STAFF	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OTHER PUBLIC AGENCY STAFF	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
TRAVEL/PER DIEM	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
PROGRAM FACILITY(IES) RENT OR LEASE	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE ON AN ATTACHED SEPARATE SHEET)	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
TOTAL	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

\*Please identify next to dollar amount for each category (H) Hard Match, (I) In-Kind

\* Express requested funding and match amounts in whole dollars only

<p><b><i>SECTION 4 – MIOCRG STRATEGY COMMITTEE</i></b></p>
--

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
_____	SHERIFF OR DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS	_____
_____	CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER	_____
_____	LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY	_____
_____	COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH DIRECTOR	_____
_____	SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE	_____
_____	CLIENT – MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT FACILITY	_____N/A_____
_____	REPRESENTATIVES FROM ORGANIZATIONS THAT CAN PROVIDE OR HAVE PROVIDED TREATMENT OR STABILITY INCLUDING INCOME, HOUSING, AND CARETAKING FOR PERSONS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS	_____
_____	OPTIONAL MEMBER	_____
_____	OPTIONAL MEMBER	_____
_____	OPTIONAL MEMBER	_____

\* Attach additional pages as necessary. All members of the MIOCRG Strategy Committee must also be listed in the Board of Supervisors' resolution (Section 6).

### ***SECTION 5 - NARRATIVE***

- A. Provide a one-page abstract summarizing the proposed program.
- B. Complete a Research Overview and Summary Form (Attachment B) for the program.
- C. Attach a narrative limited to **not more than 20 double-spaced pages**, including graphs and charts, using a 12-point font, and addressing each of the elements set forth in the instructions. Do not include attachments or appendices to the narrative. There are no exceptions to the 20-page limit per application. Applications that do not meet this requirement may be rejected.

### ***SECTION 6 - BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' RESOLUTION***

Attach a Board of Supervisors' Resolution authorizing the application for the Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grant Demonstration Program. See Attachment C for a list of the elements that must, at a minimum, be included in the resolution.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE  
PROPOSAL FOR THE MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER CRIME REDUCTION (MIOCR)  
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM GRANT  
ATTACHMENT A**

---

***GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS***

- The original and 15 copies of the grant proposal may be mailed to the Board of Corrections at 600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA 95814 and must be post-marked by midnight **March 1, 2001**.
- Hand delivered proposals must be delivered to the Board of Corrections at 600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA 95814, by 5:00 p.m. on **March 1, 2001**.
- The original and 15 copies of the Local Plan must be submitted with the proposal.
- Develop a two-page summary of the Local Plan. Submit this summary and 15 copies with the demonstration grant proposal.

***SECTION 1 - COUNTY INFORMATION***

- Enter date of application.
- Check whether single county or multiple (regional) application.
- Enter county name, or county names if multiple (regional) county application.
- Enter name of program and number (e.g., 1 of 1, 1 of 2, etc.).
- Enter name of Sheriff or Director, Department of Corrections. NOTE: ONLY ONE Sheriff or Director, Department of Corrections CAN BE DESIGNATED FOR A REGIONAL APPLICATION.
- Enter name of department, address of Sheriff or Director, Department of Corrections, telephone and facsimile numbers, and e-mail address.
- Enter name and title of designated Contact Person. The identified contact person should be directly involved in the administration of the grant in order to quickly resolve technical issues that may arise in the grant application. NOTE: ONLY ONE CONTACT PERSON CAN BE DESIGNATED FOR A REGIONAL APPLICATION.
- Enter name of department, and address of Contact Person, telephone and facsimile numbers, and e-mail address.
- Enter name and title of designated Financial Officer. NOTE: ONLY ONE FINANCIAL OFFICER CAN BE DESIGNATED FOR A REGIONAL APPLICATION.
- Enter name of department, and address of Financial Officer, telephone, facsimile numbers, and e-mail address

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE  
PROPOSAL FOR THE MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER CRIME REDUCTION (MIOCR)  
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM GRANT  
ATTACHMENT A**

---

***SECTION 2 - COST SUMMARY***

- NOTE: COUNTIES ARE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE LOCAL MATCH.
- Enter amount of state funds sought through this application (express in whole dollars).
- Identify a minimum of 25% matching funds obtained from other sources. Matching funds can be “Hard,” such as cash to support demonstration program activities from the county's general fund, or other local programs, foundations, or other private institutions, or “In-Kind,” such as personnel, services, supplies, etc. Hard and In-kind matches can be in any combination of percentages so long as they total a minimum of 25% of the total grant funds requested (expressed in whole dollars). In awarding grants, priority will be given to those programs, which include additional funding in excess of the minimum 25% match of the amount of the grant. Each proposal should address the effort made by the county to identify and develop available resources and will be individually rated on the county's ability to demonstrate a specific strategy to accomplish a collaborative and integrated approach to maximize the use of all available resources.
- Identify total amount of funds to be utilized for the demonstration program(s).

***SECTION 3 - DETAILED BUDGET***

Provide a **SEPARATE** cost breakdown detailing how **STATE FUNDS** and **MATCH FUNDS** are to be expended for items/activities necessary to implement the proposed program. **Items/activities eligible for grant funding are as follows:**

- County/City or other public agency staff costs limited to salary and benefits.
- Travel and Per Diem Costs for county/city staff are limited to within the state, consistent with county policy.
- Administrative Overhead for such purposes as printing, copying, mailing, telephone calls, office supplies, and equipment rental, as necessary, not to exceed 10% of the grant amount requested.
- Costs to pay for professional services to prepare a response to the RFP are not allowable. However, costs for professional services are eligible with the award of demonstration program grant funds for activities associated with the implementation and evaluation of programs developed to reduce:
  - crime committed by mentally ill offenders,
  - criminal justice costs, and
  - jail crowding.
- Consultants may be used primarily to assist in the implementation of proposed programs, data collection and analysis, or to augment county/city staff in these activities. Travel and Per Diem Costs for these services are limited to within the State of California and consistent with county/city policy.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE  
PROPOSAL FOR THE MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER CRIME REDUCTION (MIOCR)  
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM GRANT  
ATTACHMENT A**

---

- Costs to pay for rent or lease of office space or facilities are allowable for the period of time identified in the demonstration program.
- Costs to pay for direct client services provided by community-based organizations related to one or more of the elements of the continuum of care, identified in the Local Plan, are allowable.
- Furniture and equipment exceeding \$1,000 per item must be pre-approved by the BOC. In all cases the lowest cost for the duration of the program must be justified in the consideration of lease or purchase.

**Examples of items ineligible for funding include but are not limited to:**

- Furniture and Equipment exceeding \$1,000 per item in cost without BOC approval.
- Any costs incurred before the grant award date.
- Costs associated with staff or activities not directly related to the proposed program.
- Supplantation of existing programs.
- Construction of facilities.

***SECTION 4 – MIOCRG STRATEGY COMMITTEE***

Identify the members of the MIOCRG Strategy Committee by listing their names, titles, and organizations. Chapters 501 of the Statutes of 1998 (SB1485) outlines the required membership. (See Attachment E.)

***SECTION 5 – NARRATIVE***

Provide a one-page abstract summarizing your program. If the county submits more than one proposal each application must contain a one-page abstract.

Complete a Research Overview and Summary Form for each program. If the county submits more than one proposal, each application must contain a Research and Summary Form. (See Attachment B for form and instructions.)

Provide a brief **HISTORY** of the activities which have occurred in the past five years to expand or establish a continuum of swift, certain and graduated responses to reduce crime and criminal justice costs related to mentally ill offenders. Address each of the following:

- Collaborative and integrated approaches for achieving solutions that reduce crime and criminal justice costs related to mentally ill offenders.
- The history of maximizing federal, state and local funds and the use of alternative funding sources to develop programs to reduce crime and criminal justice costs related to mentally ill offenders.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT.** Describe the current condition of the local justice system and



**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE  
PROPOSAL FOR THE MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER CRIME REDUCTION (MIOCR)  
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM GRANT  
ATTACHMENT A**

---

how/why these conditions need to be addressed. Include in the problem statement the size of your county's mentally ill offender population and the target population(s) your program plans to address.

The overall goal for the MIOCRG Strategy Committee is to develop a comprehensive, collaborative and integrated plan for implementing a swift, certain, and graduated response for reducing crime and criminal justice costs related to mentally ill offenders. Describe the local objectives established which address this goal and the above-stated problems.

Provide a brief description of the activities associated with the development of the Local Plan and the commitment of the members of the MIOCRG Strategy Committee to the Local Plan. Include the process the MIOCRG Strategy Committee will use for implementation of the Local Plan. *(Note: Counties are required to submit the original and 15 copies of their Local Plan with the demonstration grant proposal. Counties are also required to submit a two-page summary of the Local Plan, and 15 copies, with the grant proposal.)*

**THE PROPOSED PROGRAM.** Clearly describe the proposed program. Counties wishing to submit a request for multiple programs must submit a separate application for each program that describes a separate client population. The program description should include, but is not limited to:

- A description of roles and commitment of the key collaborative agencies participating in the proposed program.
- A description of current or planned capacity to administer the proposed program. Provide a description of how the proposed demonstration program will be implemented and operated, including key dates and activities, proposed staffing and other resource allocations.
- A description of each element of the continuum of responses to mentally ill offenders with reference to existing and proposed interventions to provide treatment and stability of persons with mental illness.
- A description of the basic research design for the program. (Note: Both process and outcome evaluations must be conducted.)
- A delineation of the relationship between the needs identified in the Local Plan and the proposed demonstration program.
- Information to justify funding of the program. This information should demonstrate that the program is reasonable and appropriate given the scope, costs, comprehensiveness of the research design, intensiveness of the interventions, population served and the amount of county match over the minimum 25%.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE  
PROPOSAL FOR THE MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER CRIME REDUCTION (MIOCR)  
DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM GRANT  
ATTACHMENT A**

---

- Information in support of how the proposed demonstration program, if proven successful, will be continued after state funding ends.

***SECTION 6 - BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' RESOLUTION***

Attach a Board of Supervisors' Resolution authorizing the application for the Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grant (MIOCRG) Demonstration Program (see Attachment C). The resolution shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

- Joint Powers Agreement or memorandum of understanding, if a multiple county (regional) application.
- Identification of the Sheriff or Director, Department of Corrections as the Chair of the MIOCRG Strategy Committee.
- Authorization for the Sheriff or Director, Department of Corrections or the chairman of the Board of Supervisors to submit and/or sign the application for funding, grant contract, amendments, and/or extensions.
- Identification of MIOCRG Strategy Committee Members by name and title.
- Assurance that the county will not supplant MIOCRG Demonstration Grant funds.
- Assurance that the county intends to enter into an agreement with the state, relative to the expenditure of funds, program implementation and evaluation, by no later than July 1, 2001, should a grant award be forthcoming.
- Assurance that the county will adhere to Board of Corrections' requirements and contract terms in the expenditure of grant funds.
- Assurance that the county will participate in the collection of required common data elements, program evaluation activities and conduct an evaluation of their proposed program.
- Assurance that the county will invoice the Board of Corrections for grant costs on a quarterly basis beginning October 1, 2001 and no later than October 15, 2004.

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER CRIME REDUCTION GRANT**  
**PROGRAM EVALUATION OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY FORM**

This form is intended to be used in three ways:

1. To help counties develop their research design by identifying the critical components of an evaluation design;
2. For counties to use as a summary of their research design for inclusion in the MIOCRG 2000 proposal; and
3. To include as part of the contract between funded counties and the Board of Corrections. In that way, this document will identify the procedures the county has committed to perform in its evaluation activities.

**Overview of program evaluation for the MIOCRG**

Outcome research is important for this grant because the grant goal is to find out “what works” in terms of effectively intervening with mentally ill offenders. Of course, answering the question, “What works?” requires that we assess the benefits of any new program in comparison with some reasonable alternative.

We assume that most bidders will design programs for mentally ill offenders that are significantly different in some important ways from the current, standard approaches. Therefore, their research will address the following question: “Do the new, alternative approaches and interventions produce better results, in terms of important outcome measures, than the existing, standard or traditional approaches?”

The evaluation design will be assessed by the Executive Steering Committee in terms of the design’s potential for clearly identifying the relative merits of the current approach versus the new, alternative approach.

In developing a research design, bidders should take care to address important issues with regard to involving human beings in research. The basic requirement is, “do no harm.” Therefore, no one should be denied necessary treatment and risks should be eliminated or minimized to anyone participating in the program. No one participating in your research should receive less care than is prescribed by current community standards. Informed consent must be included, and confidentiality maintained, whenever appropriate. County counsels and professional researchers should be consulted regarding any requirement for completing an Institutional Review Board (Human Subjects’ Review) process.

**Instructions for completing the Program Evaluation Summary Form**

**County Name** – please make sure this information is provided.

**Program Name** – this identifier helps us distinguish each program from the others.

**Description of Target Population, Criteria for Identification, and Matching Criteria** – This section asks you to specify the characteristics of the population you intend to serve, articulate the source(s) of information you will use to determine whether a particular individual meets program criteria, identify the characteristics you think should be matched across participant groups, identify the size of each group (treatment and comparison), and explain how you arrived at your proposed sample size. Experience has taught us that proposals frequently overestimate the number of people in a county who meet the eligibility criteria and who can be recruited within the life of the funding. A large sample size, independent of other factors, does not increase a proposal's chance of being funded. It can, however, create a difficult situation for county staff charged with implementing the program as written.

**Proposed Model, Interventions for the Comparison Group, and Proposed Interventions** – This section asks you to describe, briefly, the theory or model upon which you're basing your proposed program. You are also asked to describe the services, or interventions, that will be available for the comparison, or "treatment-as-usual" group. Finally, please describe the services that you will be providing the treatment, or "alternative treatment" group, if funded. This section should provide a clear picture of the interventions you intend to provide that will improve outcomes for mentally ill offenders.

**Criteria for Program Completion or Termination** – This section asks for criteria your program will use to determine whether a client has completed the program. If your program is not designed to end, but will continue for all participants until the funding ceases, please so indicate. This section also asks that you define the conditions under which you would terminate participants from the program, e.g., no longer provide them services or support (although you would continue to gather and report outcome data on this person). For example, some programs terminate participants if they commit a violent offense or are sent to prison.

**Evaluation Design(s)** – There are two types of evaluations that must occur for the MIOCRG and one that is optional. The required evaluations are the outcome evaluation and the process evaluation. The optional evaluation component focuses on program cost-effectiveness.

**Outcome Evaluation** – What design will you utilize to answer the question: "Do the new, alternative approaches and interventions produce better outcomes for mentally ill offenders than the existing or standard interventions?" We prefer the true experimental design with randomly selected groups. This design automatically accounts for a number of potential confounders (e.g., changes due to age, changes in the law, the impact of other programs that target the mentally ill (AB 34) or those with substance abuse problems, etc).

If you choose an evaluation model other than the true experimental design, please describe how you will account for the potential contributions or impacts of other programs (see list above) in explaining any program benefits you identify.

**Cost-Benefit Analysis** – Identify whether or not you will assess the fiscal impact of the MIOCRG on reducing criminal justice costs and, if so, what design you have in mind.

**Process Evaluation** - This component of the evaluation will require that you document and analyze program implementation and management activities. Please describe what the process evaluation will include, how you will organize that effort and what type of information you will gather.

**Hypothesis Testing** – Within the MIOCRG, hypotheses can be tested with either quantitative or qualitative data (although we refer to hypotheses that use qualitative data as “questions”). Please keep in mind that we expect that you will utilize some quantitative data to allow comparisons against other programs.

- Identify the hypotheses (quantitative data) and questions (qualitative data) you will test during this research program. For your hypotheses, describe the outcome data you will gather to test your hypotheses.
- Identify the questions you will ask of qualitative data and identify the type and content of information you will gather (e.g., interviews to gather client’s perspective on program benefits, case studies, observations of client behavior, etc.).

**Intake, Background, and Intervention Data Collection** – Describe other data you will be gathering for your analyses, including data that will be available on the comparison group.

Attachment B - Program Evaluation Summary, Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grant FY 2000		
County:		Program Name:
Description of target population, eligibility and matching criteria, and sample size		
Describe the population you'll target for interventions:		What criteria will you use to identify possible participants? (e.g., GAF scores below 50, DSM IV, individual's history of offending)
Matching Criteria for ensuring comparability of groups:		How did you determine the total sample size?
Total Sample Size: Treatment:	Comparison:	
Current Interventions, Proposed Model and Interventions		
Model: Describe the model you've based the program on. How did you determine it was appropriate for your county and the target population?		
Interventions that will be available to the "treatment-as-usual" (comparison) group:		
Proposed Interventions that will be provided the "alternative treatment" (treatment) group:		
Criteria for Program Completion or Termination		
Completion Criteria: (describe how the program staff will know that an individual has completed the program successfully)		
Termination Criteria <sup>1</sup> : (describe the basis on which a participant would be terminated from the program before completing)		
Evaluation Design(s) (continued on next page)		
Outcome Evaluation Design (check one) (continued on next page)		For <i>evaluation designs other than true experimental design</i> : Describe your plans for isolating the effects of the MIOCRG from the effects of other changes or services.
<input type="checkbox"/>	True experimental (e.g., random assignment to treatment and comparison groups)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quasi-experimental with matched contemporaneous groups	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quasi-experimental with matched historical group	

<sup>1</sup> Programs must continue to gather and analyze data on individuals who are terminated from the program.

	Longitudinal for treatment group, no comparison group	
	Other (please describe):	
<b>Cost Benefit Analysis Design:</b> Will you perform a cost benefit analysis? (circle one) Yes No. If yes, please describe what you intend to do.		
<b>Process Evaluation Approach:</b> Describe what you intend to do.		
<b>Hypotheses Testing and Outcome Data/Indicators</b>		
<b>Hypotheses you will test <u>quantitatively</u>:</b>		<b>Quantitative outcome variables</b> for testing hypotheses
<b>Questions you will answer with qualitative data</b>		<b>Qualitative Information</b> you will collect to answer the questions:
<b>Process Evaluation Data:</b> Describe the information you will gather and how it will be gathered.		
<b>Intake, Background, Intervention, and Independent Variables Data Collection Activities</b>		
<b>What data will you collect</b> , and from what source, to document client intake and background status, receipt of interventions, and other important explanatory information (e.g., new county project that will impact comparison group members):		

**ATTACHMENT C**  
**SAMPLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESOLUTION**  
**MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER CRIME REDUCTION**  
**DEMONSTRATION GRANT**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County Of \_\_\_\_\_ hereby:

Appoints Sheriff or Director, Department of Corrections \_\_\_\_\_ as the Chair of the \_\_\_\_\_ County MIOCR Strategy Committee; and,

Authorizes said Sheriff or Director, Department of Corrections, or the chairperson of the Board of Supervisors to submit and/or to sign \_\_\_\_\_ County's application for State funding as well as related contracts, amendments, or extensions with the State of California; and,

Appoints the following individuals as members of the \_\_\_\_\_ County MIOCR Strategy Committee:

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Assures that the County of \_\_\_\_\_ will not supplant MIOCR Demonstration Grant funds;

Assures that the County of \_\_\_\_\_ intends to enter into an agreement with the state, relative to the expenditure of funds, and program implementation and evaluation should a grant award be forthcoming by not later than June 30, 2001;

Assures that the County of \_\_\_\_\_ will adhere to the requirements of the Board of Corrections and all conditions specified in the grant contract with the State of California in the expenditure of State funds received pursuant to said application;



Assures that \_\_\_\_\_ County will participate in the collection of required common research data, program evaluation activities and conduct an evaluation of their proposed project; and,

Certifies that the County of \_\_\_\_\_ will invoice the Board of Corrections for all costs approved in the grant on a quarterly basis beginning October 1, 2001 and not later than October 15, 2004.

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER DEFINED FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE**  
**MIOCRG DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM**

It is important to determine the target population of “mentally ill offender.” Senate Bill 1485 (Attachment E) relies on Section 5600.3 of the Welfare and Institutions Code for its definition of mental illness. According to this section, the mentally ill offender targeted by the MIOCRG Grant must have:

1. a mental disorder as identified in the most recent edition of the International Classification of Disorders (ICD) or Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders of the American Psychiatric Association (other than a substance use disorder, developmental disorder, or acquired traumatic brain disorder, unless the person also has some other serious mental disorder) as determined by a licensed mental health professional; and
2. serious functional impairments, symptoms or psychiatric history such that, without treatment, there is imminent risk of further decompensation (especially in terms of the ability to engage in independent living, positive social relationships, and vocational opportunities).

There are hundreds of mental disorders identified in the most recent version of the International Classification of Disorders (ICD) or the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-IV). It is impossible for the BOC to determine on its own the myriad of diagnostic categories that are prevalent and problematic in the many different localities in California. The BOC has no preconceived ideas regarding which diagnostic categories present the greatest or most frequent problems for the criminal justice system, or the best opportunities for successful and cost-effective interventions. Therefore, for the purposes of the MIOCRG RFP, the ESC:

1. Encourages interested agencies to pay close attention to the language in SB 1485 and the Welfare and Institutions Code in developing their own definitions of the mentally ill offender target group; and
2. Encourages the development of a locally defined target group that is:
  - Sufficiently large so that a successful program can have a meaningful and positive effect on the criminal justice system, and so that reliable and measurable conclusions can be drawn from the demonstration project (i.e., in terms of a reduction in crime committed by mentally ill offenders, criminal justice costs, and jail crowding);
  - Defined in terms of the diagnostic categories that will best address the needs of the local mentally ill population; and
  - Consistent with the needs and resources of the local jurisdiction.

Proposals will be evaluated in terms of the case made by the local jurisdiction for working with a specific, locally determined target group. In all cases, the BOC requires that grant participants submit, as part of their reporting requirements, the DSM-IV and/or ICD diagnoses for all members of the demonstration grant research sample.

## MIOCRG RFP ATTACHMENT E

BILL NUMBER: SB 1485    CHAPTERED  
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER    501  
FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE    SEPTEMBER 15, 1998  
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR    SEPTEMBER 15, 1998  
PASSED THE SENATE    AUGUST 30, 1998  
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY    AUGUST 27, 1998  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY    AUGUST 21, 1998  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY    JULY 8, 1998  
AMENDED IN SENATE    MAY 5, 1998  
AMENDED IN SENATE    APRIL 1, 1998

INTRODUCED BY    Senator Rosenthal  
    (Principal coauthor:    Senator Rainey)  
    (Coauthor:    Senator McPherson)  
    (Coauthors:    Assembly Members Hertzberg, Migden, Papan,  
Strom-Martin, Sweeney, and Thomson)

FEBRUARY 4, 1998

An act to add and repeal Article 4 (commencing with Section 6045) of Chapter 5 of Title 7 of Part 3 of the Penal Code, relating to mentally ill criminal offenders.

### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1485, Rosenthal.    Mentally ill offender crime reduction grants.

Under existing law, it is the duty of the Board of Corrections to make a study of the entire subject of crime, with particular reference to conditions in the State of California, including causes of crime, possible methods of prevention of crime, methods of detection of crime, and apprehension of criminals, methods of prosecution of persons accused of crime, and the entire subject of penology, including standards and training for correctional personnel, and to report its findings, its conclusions and recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature as required.

This bill would require, until January 1, 2005, the Board of Corrections to administer and award mentally ill offender crime reduction grants on a competitive basis to counties that expand or establish a continuum of swift, certain, and graduated responses to reduce crime and criminal justice costs related to mentally ill offenders. The bill would require the board, in consultation with the State Department of Mental Health and the State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, to create an evaluation design for the grant program that will assess the effectiveness of the program in reducing crime, the number of early releases due to jail overcrowding, and local criminal justice costs, and would require the board to submit annual reports to the Legislature based on the evaluation design. The bill would require funding for the program to be provided, upon appropriation by the Legislature, in the annual Budget Act.

## MIOCRG RFP ATTACHMENT E

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Legislature hereby finds and declares all of the following:

(a) County jail inmate populations nearly doubled between 1984 and 1996, from 43,000 to 72,000. Court-ordered population caps have affected 25 counties and represent 70 percent of the average daily population in county jails. As a result of these caps and a lack of bed space, more than 275,000 inmates had their jail time eliminated or reduced in 1997.

(b) An estimated 7 to 15 percent of county jail inmates are seriously mentally ill. Although an estimated forty million dollars (\$40,000,000) per year is spent by counties on mental health treatment within the institution, and that figure is rising rapidly, there are few treatment and intervention resources available to prevent recidivism after mentally ill offenders are released into the community. This leads to a cycle of rearrest and reincarceration, contributing to jail overcrowding and early releases, and often culminates in state prison commitments.

(c) The Pacific Research Institute estimates that annual criminal justice and law enforcement expenditures for persons with serious mental illnesses were between one billion two hundred million dollars (\$1,200,000,000) and one billion eight hundred million dollars (\$1,800,000,000) in 1993-94. The state cost in 1996-97 to incarcerate and provide mental health treatment to a seriously mentally ill state prisoner is between twenty-one thousand nine hundred seventy-eight dollars (\$21,978) and thirty thousand six hundred ninety-eight dollars (\$30,698) per year. Estimates of the state prison population with mental illness ranges from 8 to 20 percent.

(d) According to a 1993 study by state mental health directors, the average estimated cost to provide comprehensive mental health treatment to a severely mentally ill person is seven thousand dollars (\$7,000) per year, of which the state and county cost is four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per year. The 1996 cost for integrated mental health services for persons most difficult to treat averages between fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) and twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) per year, of which the state and county costs are between nine thousand dollars (\$9,000) and twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000) per person.

(e) A 1997 study by the State Department of Mental Health of 3,000 seriously mentally ill persons found that less than 2 percent of the persons receiving regular treatment were arrested in the previous six months, indicating that crimes and offenses are caused by those not receiving treatment. Another study of 85 persons with serious mental illness in the Los Angeles County Jail found that only three of the persons were under conservatorship at the time of their arrest, and only two had ever received intensive treatment. Another study of 500 mentally ill persons charged with crimes in San Francisco found that 94 percent were not receiving mental health treatment at the time the crimes were committed.

(f) Research indicates that a continuum of responses for mentally ill offenders that includes prevention, intervention, and incarceration can reduce crime, jail overcrowding, and criminal justice costs.

(g) Therefore, it is the intent of the Legislature that grants

## MIOCRG RFP ATTACHMENT E

shall be provided to counties that develop and implement a comprehensive, cost-effective plan to reduce the rate of crime and offenses committed by persons with serious mental illness, as well as reduce jail overcrowding and local criminal justice costs related to mentally ill offenders.

SEC. 2. Article 4 (commencing with Section 6045) is added to Chapter 5 of Title 7 of Part 3 of the Penal Code, to read:

### Article 4. Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grants

6045. The Board of Corrections shall administer and award mentally ill offender crime reduction grants on a competitive basis to counties that expand or establish a continuum of swift, certain, and graduated responses to reduce crime and criminal justice costs related to mentally ill offenders, as defined in paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) and subdivision (c) of Section 5600.3 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

6045.2. (a) To be eligible for a grant, each county shall establish a strategy committee that shall include, at a minimum, the sheriff or director of the county department of corrections in a county where the sheriff is not in charge of administering the county jail system, who shall chair the committee, representatives from other local law enforcement agencies, the chief probation officer, the county mental health director, a superior court judge, a client of a mental health treatment facility, and representatives from organizations that can provide, or have provided, treatment or stability, including income, housing, and caretaking, for persons with mental illnesses.

(b) The committee shall develop a comprehensive plan for providing a cost-effective continuum of graduated responses, including prevention, intervention, and incarceration, for mentally ill offenders. Strategies for prevention and intervention shall include, but are not limited to, both of the following:

(1) Mental health or substance abuse treatment for mentally ill offenders who have been released from law enforcement custody.

(2) The establishment of long-term stability for mentally ill offenders who have been released from law enforcement custody, including a stable source of income, a safe and decent residence, and a conservator or caretaker.

(c) The plan shall include the identification of specific outcome and performance measures and a plan for annual reporting that will allow the Board of Corrections to evaluate, at a minimum, the effectiveness of the strategies in reducing:

(1) Crime and offenses committed by mentally ill offenders.

(2) Criminal justice costs related to mentally ill offenders.

6045.4. The Board of Corrections, in consultation with the State Department of Mental Health, and the State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, shall award grants that provide funding for four years. Funding shall be used to supplement, rather than supplant, funding for existing programs and shall not be used to facilitate the early release of prisoners or alternatives to incarceration. No grant shall be awarded unless the applicant makes available resources in an amount equal to at least 25 percent of the amount of the grant. Resources may include in-kind contributions from participating agencies. In awarding grants, priority shall be given to those proposals which include additional funding that exceeds 25 percent of the amount of the grant.

## **MIOCRG RFP ATTACHMENT E**

6045.6. The Board of Corrections, in consultation with the State Department of Mental Health and the State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, shall establish minimum standards, funding schedules, and procedures for awarding grants, which shall take into consideration, but not be limited to, all of the following:

- (a) Percentage of the jail population with severe mental illness.
- (b) Demonstrated ability to administer the program.
- (c) Demonstrated ability to develop effective responses to provide treatment and stability for persons with severe mental illness.
- (d) Demonstrated history of maximizing federal, state, local, and private funding sources.
- (e) Likelihood that the program will continue to operate after state grant funding ends.

6045.8. The Board of Corrections, in consultation with the State Department of Mental Health and the State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, shall create an evaluation design for mentally ill offender crime reduction grants that will assess the effectiveness of the program in reducing crime, the number of early releases due to jail overcrowding, and local criminal justice costs. Commencing on June 30, 2000, and annually thereafter, the board shall submit a report to the Legislature based on the evaluation design, with a final report due on December 31, 2004.

6045.9. This article shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2005, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2005, deletes or extends that date.

6046. Funding for mentally ill offender crime reduction grants shall be provided, upon appropriation by the Legislature, in the annual Budget Act. It is the intent of the Legislature to appropriate twenty-five million dollars (\$25,000,000) for the purposes of Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grants in the 1999-2000 fiscal year, subject to the availability of funds. Up to 5 percent of the amount appropriated in the budget may be available for the board to administer this program, including technical assistance to counties and the development of an evaluation component.

**ATTACHMENT F**  
**MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER CRIME REDUCTION GRANTS FY 2000**  
**PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**1. Bidder's History of Past Efforts - 16 points**

The bidder supplies information concerning the history of past efforts in the areas of program design, implementation, management, and success; collaborative, multi-disciplinary and innovative approaches to problem solving; and obtaining and maximizing funding. Taken together, this information makes a good case for the bidder being able to develop and manage an effective MIOCRG Demonstration Program.

**2. Need for the Program - 24 points**

The Local Plan makes a clear and compelling argument for the need for the program, and the content of the proposed program effectively addresses the need. There is a direct and well-articulated relationship between the described needs and the manner in which the proposed program will address those needs.

**3. Collaborative, Multi-Agency, Multi-Disciplinary - 30 points**

The proposed program includes significant collaboration, multiple-agency involvement and multi-disciplinary participation. Written MOUs are included that document the scope and level of the collaboration and involvement. The uniqueness of collaborating agencies is appropriately utilized in the design of the program.

**4. Probability of Success - 30 points**

This criterion concerns the degree to which the proposal rater is convinced that the program will be successful based upon the rater's assessment of the reasonableness, practicality, and appropriateness of the program design.

**5. Evaluation Design - 20 points**

The program evaluation design contains the following elements: 1) a methodology and research design; 2) a complete and clear research plan; 3) meaningful hypotheses; 4) appropriate hypothesis-testing procedures; and 5) an appropriate and adequate sample.

**6. Likelihood That Program Will Continue - 10 points**

The proposal indicates that there will be support to continue the program if it is proven effective. Examples are provided of past instances where grant programs were continued. Detailed plans and commitments to seek and develop funding alternatives are discussed. The budget demonstrates increasing county fiscal responsibility over the life of the grant.

**7. Proposal Quality - 30 points**

The bidder submits a well presented proposal that contains all the required contents, including: a) the activities associated with the development of the Local Plan; b) the commitment of the members of the Strategy Committee; c) a detailed assessment of existing resources for mentally ill offenders across the continuum of responses (from prevention to hospitalization); d) specific and detailed identification of gaps in services; e) a description of the methodology that will be used to implement the recommendations in the plan, including a discussion of specific activities, funding alternatives and timelines; f) an explanation of the program evaluation approach and methodology; g) a description of the method for assessing the cost effectiveness of the program; and h) a clearly presented budget.

**8. The Oral Presentation - 20 points**

The oral presentation is appropriately related to, supportive of, and consistent with the Local Plan and the proposal. Areas identified in the technical review as needing clarification, if any, are addressed fully and in a concise manner.

**9. Justification for Funding Request - 20 points**

The amount of requested funds is reasonable and appropriate given the project scope, project costs, the anticipated benefits, the comprehensiveness of the research design, the intensiveness of the interventions, the population served, and the amount of the match over the minimum 25%.